



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SATURA AS A GENERIC TERM

BY ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

In *Classical Philology* for April, 1911, Professor G. L. Hendrickson expressed his view that *satura* had not become an accepted generic term when Horace wrote *Satires* i. 4 and 10, and that it was not in reality so accepted until about 30 B.C., when it appears for the first time in extant Roman literature (*ibid.* ii. 1. 1). Professor Hendrickson would limit the final and successful struggle of the word for the position of a generic term to the decade 40–30 B.C.

My serious doubts concerning this view were forcibly recalled¹ by Professor Ingersoll's supplementary article (*Class. Phil.*, January, 1912), and it is worth while to enter upon a little friendly controversy with these scholars since the question is important in literary history. We must remember, however, that because of fragmentary material we are dealing with probability, not certainty.

The points adduced by Professor Hendrickson to support his view "that *satura* as the designation of a form of literature was either not in existence or not in current usage down to the decade 40–30 B.C."² are derived in part from Marx's well-known *Prolegomena to Lucilius* and may be stated as follows:

1. The rare occurrence of *satura* as a literary term, especially its absence from "contexts which seem fairly to clamor for it in Horace's first book of *Sermones*," and the vague terminology used by Varro, Cicero, Horace, etc., for the genre.

2. The probability that "neither Varro nor Verrius Flaccus explained the word as the name of a poetical form, nor alluded to it."

3. The lack of evidence from Ennius and Lucilius that they used *satura* to designate what we call their "satires," and (positively) the fact that Lucilius used other terms, for example, *ludi*, *sermones*, and *schedium*.

¹ Professor Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.* VI, 342 (July, 1911), reaffirms his views and uses his results as an argument against A. Klotz (on Varro).

² Sentences thus quoted are from Hendrickson's article.

4. To Cicero, Velleius, etc., Lucilius is "an individual, and not the representative of a literary genus." "For Cicero apparently his work is as individual as the man himself."

Marx, using only part of this evidence, suggested that Ennius called his satires *poemata per saturam*, that Lucilius altered this to *sermones per saturam*, and that *satura* as a noun and a generic literary term came into use before Horace. This would indicate as the period in which *satura* is supposed to have ousted whatever term Ennius and Lucilius used the sixty or seventy years between the death of Lucilius and the composition of Horace's satires. Professor Hendrickson's view is, therefore, a refinement of Marx's doctrine: instead of seventy years for the successful struggle of *satura* to generic prominence only ten years are allowed.¹ This theory even in the form stated by Marx would cause nothing short of a revolution in our attitude toward the *testimonia* concerning *satura*. Professor Hendrickson burns his bridges behind him! He rejects other possible explanations of his facts: that the rare and late occurrence of the term *satura* may be "a matter of accident, a caprice of fortune in the preservation of literary monuments"; that "a technical designation is something which we might expect to find avoided"; that the vague terminology of Horace may be "merely a matter of chance or of taste in the choice of literary expressions." According to my own view these three possibilities, even if viewed as mere assumptions, afford a far more probable explanation of the facts than Professor Hendrickson's theory. But we may go beyond mere assumption and show that they have far better positive support, and this I shall try to prove, considering Professor Hendrickson's points in order.

The first point is of vital importance to the argument. The remaining points are in fact either involved in or subsidiary to this main issue. If a convincing explanation differing from that of Professor Hendrickson can be given for the facts presented under this head, his entire theory will have but little to commend it. Now the cardinal defect of Professor Hendrickson's argument on this point is that he takes too narrow a view. The question is not

¹ The more liberal views of Marx have not met with general acceptance; cf. Leo, *Götting. gelehrt. Anz.* (1906), p. 859; Lommatzsch, *Bu. Jhb.* 139 (1908), etc.

whether the term *satura* occurs rarely, is absent where one might expect it, and has numerous substitutes more or less vague, but how in general Roman poets speak of their own work and that of others. If the situation within the realm of satire is closely paralleled in other genres, then we cannot infer that *satura* had the astonishing history which Professor Hendrickson outlines. Only once in his article do I find an allusion to the possibility that the same vague and varied terminology may be applied to other genres, and in that one allusion he merely puts the question, and puts it narrowly. “It may be questioned,” he says, “whether any other literary name [than that of Lucilius] of equal prominence figures in the works of Cicero so vaguely.” But since the manner of Cicero’s references to poets and poetry is of secondary importance to the present question, I pass him by for the moment¹ and turn to that which is of the first importance: the expressions applied in general by Roman poets to their work and in particular those expressions which occur in program poems like Horace’s *Satires* i. 4, 1. 10, ii. 1. The first of these questions has been investigated, and I take most of the following examples from the collections of F. Barta,² whose second program contains a mass of material bearing directly on our present question, since the expressions used for “poem” include those employed by the poets for their own compositions—in whatever genre they may be working. The variety of the terms for poem and poetry is astonishing even to one who may be very familiar with Roman poetry. Poets are not grammarians and have little need of precise terms. Certainly they would show little taste in repeating such terms often. Barta classifies under sixty-five heads or, if we include the terms for “writing poetry,” under one hundred heads!³ It is

¹ See pp. 474.

² *Ueber die auf die Dichtkunst bezüglichen Ausdrücke bei den römischen Dichtern*, i. “dichten” and “Dichter”; ii. “Gedicht,” two programs, Linz, 1889, 1890. Barta has covered nearly all Roman poetry of the first three centuries and much that is later. He includes some prose (Cicero’s *Pro Archia* and Pliny’s *Letters*). I have not seen M. Vogt’s *Der Buchtitel in der römischen Poesie*, Diss., Munich, 1900, nor E. Lohan, *De librorum titulis apud classicos scriptores*, etc., Marburg, 1890. There are, of course, many analogues in Greek which I have not touched. G. Kuhlmann has investigated this subject in his dissertation *De poetae et poematis Graecorum appellacionibus*, Marburg, 1906.

³ Some of Horace’s expressions involve a verb, e.g., *haec ego ludo*.

enough to say in general that the terms range all the way from common words, such as *carmen*, *libellus*, *opus*, etc., to rare metaphors—*amores*, *ignes*, *honores*, *apinae*, etc. Precise and generic terms are comparatively rare. This general practice is parallel to that of Horace in whom also the vague and precise terms occur side by side, but the latter are comparatively infrequent. But the particular interest of Barta's collections for us is that they enable us to follow the very terms used by Horace of satire into other genres and to answer the question whether other poets use them when they have other genres in mind, just as Horace uses them of satire. The answer is a decided affirmative. All of these terms occur, most of them frequently, in passages which are concerned with a definite genre. The fact is so clearly established that a few typical illustrations will suffice.

scriptum

Catullus xxxvi. 7:

electissima pessimi poetae

scripta

(the *Annales Volusi* v. 1, although Lesbia had meant a different genre!).

Propertius iii. 9. 45 (Rothstein):

haec urant pueros, haec urant *scripta* puellas

(his own elegies); iii. 23. 2; Ovid *Ex. P.* i. 7. 30; *ibid. Tr.* ii. 517; *ibid. Ex. P.* iv. 13. 33; *Phaedrus* iv. 7. 1 *scripta* mea (of the "Fables").

versus

Cf. Hor. i. 4. 40 (of satire); cf. ii. 1. 68.

This term is very common in other poets and at times is applied to "verses" of a definite kind.

Propertius i. 9. 11:

plus in amore valet Mimnermi *versus* Homero:

(of the erotic elegy of Mimnermus).

Ibid. ii. 34. 43:

incipe iam angusto *versus* includere torno,

(of erotic elegy); *ibid.* iii. 24. 4; *ibid.* iii. 7. 77; Ovid *Tr.* v. 12. 49; *ibid. Ex. P.* ii. 2. 8; *Lucret.* i. 949; *Verg. G.* ii. 42; *Martial* x. 38. 1.

Lucil. 411 (Marx):

conicere in *versus* dictum praeconis volebam

Grani

Cf. 480 in Homeri *versibus*

688

<te> fictis *versibus* Lucilius,
quibus potest, inpertit,

cf. 1087 *<h>* is te *versibus* interea contentus teneto, cf. 1036, 968, etc. (see Marx's *Index*). In Lucilius, of course, it is often impossible to know who is talking.

genus hoc

Horace i. 4. 24 and 64. This term indicates that Horace recognized that he was writing a definite *genus* whatever its precise name. That he proceeds to define his own conception of that *genus* means no more with regard to its name than the numerous discussions about the novel mean with regard to the term "novel." The term *genus* is in itself so colorless that it requires some sort of defining adjunct such as a pronoun (Horace) or a limiting genitive. Accius¹ (*F.P.R.* 269) in his *Didascal.* says: *Nam quam varia haec genera poematorum, Baebi, quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis sint, nosce.* Ovid. *Tr.* ii. 517 *genus hoc* scripti (of the mime, cf. 515).

opus

This term is used by Horace (ii. 1. 1) in the same breath with *satura*; cf. *Epp.* i. 4. 3 *opuscula* (probably of elegy). The word is very general in meaning, and yet in the proper context is often used where the poet has a definite kind of "work" in mind.

Propertius iii. 1. 17:

*opus hoc de monte Sororum
detulit intacta pagina nostra via.*

(of his own elegy); cf. v. 34, Homerus *opus*, and iii. 3. 4, *tantum operis* (both of epic).

Ovid *Ex. P.* i. 1. 2:

Naso
hoc tibi de Getico litore mittit *opus*.

(cf. Book i of the epistles); cf. iii. 9. 54 (cf. Book iii); ii. 11. 2 (of the epistle in which the word stands). *Am.* iii. 9. 5; cf. *Elegeia* vs. 3; *Am.* iii. 15. 20; *M.* xv. 871; Lucan *Phars.* x. 198; Martial i. 25. 2.

hoc, haec

Horace i. 10. 37 *haec ego ludo* (of the satires; *ludo*, of course, defines more closely what he means). Horace has just referred to the epics of Bibaculus so vaguely that a reference here to his own work by means of a generic term would have been extremely inartistic. In the following lines there is the usual Roman combination of vague and precise terms until in 46 we have again *hoc erat melius quod scribere possem, inventore minor. . . .* So vss. 82-83, 88, 92. This pronominal habit is a prominent feature of Roman prose as well as verse, but we are interested primarily in the poets.

Propertius ii. 1. 3:

non *haec* Calliope, non *haec* mihi cantat Apollo

¹ This passage proves that *genera* were discussed in the time of Lucilius—a fact which is clear from the fragments of Lucilius himself.

(of his own elegy).

Persius i. 125:

aspice et *haec*, si forte aliquid decoctius audis,

(of his own satires).

Propertius iii. 23. 23.

Martial is full of illustrations; cf. ii. 8. 8, *haec mala sunt*; iii. 1. 1, *hoc*; x. 4. 8, *hoc*; xi, 106. 2, *hoc*. All these refer to Martial's own poetical work. Many other pronouns—*mea*, *tua*, *nostra*, *ista*, etc.—illustrate the Roman manner equally well.¹

libellus

Horace i. 4. 71 (due partly to the contrast with the *libelli*, of a different sort, in vs. 66). Like *opus* and other general terms *libellus* may be used when the poet has some special type of *libellus* in mind. Cf. Persius i. 120; Juvenal i. 86; *Phaedrus*, iv. 7. 3; Ovid *Tr.* i. 11. 1; *ibid. A.* iii. 12. 7; *ibid. Ex. P.* i. 1. 3; *F.* i. 724; *Ibis* 51 and 641; Statius, *Epist. ad Stellam*: *hos libellos*, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate fluxerant (of his *Silvae*). Barta gives over sixty cases in which Martial uses the word—very often of his own work.²

charta, chartae

Horace *Satt.* i. 4. 101 (of his satires), i. 10. 4 (of the fourth satire). Horace applies this word to his odes also; cf. c. iv. 8. 21; iv. 9. 31; *Epp.* i. 13. 6. Lucretius applies the term to the work of Epicurus; cf. *Luer.* iii. 10. In addition note Catull. lxviii. 46 (of this elegy); xxxvi. 1 and 20 (of the *Annales Volusi*); *Ciris* 62 Vollmer's ed. (Maeoniae *chartae*); *Phaedrus* iv, Epilog. to *Particulo*, *chartis* nomen victuris meis (of his fables). Martial uses the term often both of his own epigrams and the poetic work of others; cf. i. 25. 7, post te *victurae cartae* (of the poems of Faustinus); iv. 31. 4, *cartis meis*. So vii. 44. 7; viii. 24. 2; ix. 76. 10, etc.

ludo

Horace i. 10. 37, *haec ego ludo* (cf. 139, *illudo chartis*). Both the verb *ludo*³ and the noun *lusus* are not infrequently applied to poetic efforts, usually of the lighter sort; cf. Catullus i. 2, *multum lusimus* (of light erotic verse); so lxviii. 17, *multa satis lusi*; *Culex* 1 ff., *Lusimus lusimus* (of the "joke"-epyll); *Ciris* 19, *quamvis interdum ludere nobis liceat*. . . .

Ovid *Tr.* ii. 223, *lusibus ineptis* (of his erotic verse); *A.A.* iii. 809, *lusus habet finem!*

¹ On Propert. ii. 34; Ov. *Tr.* i. 7 and 11 see below, pp. 462, 465.

² Catullus i. 8 quidquid *hoc libelli*, etc., probably refers to a book of light lyrics (*nugae*), or at least to a definite poetic libellus, cf. xiv. 12.

³ On the use of the verb *ludo* for poetic composition cf. Barta's first program, pp. 12-13.

Martial i. 4. 7, *innocuos lusus* (of his epigrams); cf. vi. 85. 9; iv. 49. 2, etc., and especially ix. 84. 3, *haec ego Pieria ludebam tutus in umbra*.

Propertius ii. 34. 85, *haec quoque perfecto ludebat Iasone Varro* (of elegy).

Vergil, *G.* iv. 565, *carmina qui lusi pastorum* (of the Bucolics).

Barta's lists in spite of their fulness are not complete. It is clear that the Roman poets habitually used an exceedingly varied terminology and that terms more or less vague often occur even when they had in mind a poem or poetry of a definite kind.¹ Sometimes the vague and the generic terms are found side by side, as in Hor. *Sat.* ii. 1; sometimes there are no generic terms at all, but the vaguer terms are sufficiently defined by special modifiers or by the general context, as in Hor. *Satt.* i. 4 and 10. Horace merely illustrates the general practice—he is indeed one of the best illustrations, because of the varied nature of his poetical work. Those manifestations of the habit which occur in the *Satires* are, therefore, not peculiar; they are merely part of the general practice. The facts within the *Satires* are not primarily chance—Professor Hendrickson is right in rejecting this explanation²—but they are a matter of "taste in the choice of literary expressions," and certainly the desire "to avoid a technical designation" had some influence on this choice.

But it may be said that the vague terminology occurring in those parts of Roman poetry which are not immediately concerned with a genre stands on a different level from that of Horace's *Satires* i. 4 and 10, and ii. 1, which are concerned with a genre, and this is a fair objection to many of the passages thus far cited. The general practice is clear, but can it be shown that this general practice

¹ Lucilius falls into line with the other poets. It is often impossible to say that Lucilius is speaking of his own work, but it is certain that in general he used a varied terminology for poetic compositions whether speaking of his own poems or inserting his verses into the mouths of characters who mention poetry. The references in Marx's *Index* show this: opus (342); versus (688, his own verses; cf. 591, 411, 1087, 1036, 480, Homeri versibus); haec (596, his own writings; cf. 610, 696, 762, 1009); charta or chartus (709, Socratici carti, 1085 claris . . . cartis); poema (339 ff., the famous definition of poema and poesis, 1013, apparently his own); ludus (1039, ludo ac sermonibus, probably his own poems; cf. 1015, 1016); schedium (1279, probably of his own poems). Professor Ingersoll supplementing Marx's evidence has shown very interestingly that schedium was applied by Lucilius to his own work, but the facts I am presenting seem to show that this word was merely one of the numerous terms used by Lucilius and not a generic term.

² It is probably chance that *satura* does not occur *for us* before Horace *Sat.* ii. 1. 1 (see below).

persists even where the Roman poets are dealing with a genre? Is Horace's unprecise terminology for satire, employed in poems dealing with the nature of satire, peculiar, or is it paralleled in program poems of other poets who are dealing with other genres? The attentive reader will already have noticed that many of the preceding citations occur in program passages analogous to those satires on which Professor Hendrickson bases so much of his argument, and these passages must now be supplemented and placed in a clearer light. We cannot expect to find close parallels in the drama, the epic, or the pure lyric, since the very nature of these *genera* precludes free expression of the poet's conception of his work.¹ In elegy, didactic poetry, the lighter lyric, the epigram, and the fable we have a more promising field. Elegy holds a foremost position in this question because of its history, in which there are many analogies to that of satire, and because the elegist, like the satirist, may discuss his work with a great deal of freedom. The elegists differ, of course, in the relative frequency with which they touch upon this theme. Propertius and Ovid are fond of it, Tibullus gives it decidedly less attention—just as in satire there is a marked difference between Horace (and probably Lucilius) on the one hand and Persius and Juvenal on the other. Moreover the tendencies of the period in which the poet worked had a strong influence. Professor Hendrickson has been foremost in pointing out that Horace was writing his satires at a time when the whole theory of satire was the subject of lively discussion. The same is true of elegy, and at the same period. If the elegies of Gallus were extant, we should be able to push the analogy still farther. The whole period beginning about the year 40 b.c. was one of storm and stress in literature, continuing and supplementing many of the questions which had arisen earlier but had been thrust aside by the civil war. After the battle with the sword the battle of the books ensued. The poets were studying more carefully than ever before the nature of their work, comparing it with that of their predecessors and contemporaries both Greek and Roman, and trying to define it by contrast not only with other poems of the same *genus*,

¹ The prologues form an exception—notably those of Terence. There also we find precise and unprecise terms side by side; cf. also Plautus *Bacch.* 214, *Epidicu*m . . . *fabulam*, and the prologues of the *Amph.*, *Poen.*, *Casina*, etc.

but also with other *genera* as such. Hence the everlasting contrast of epic and other kinds which meets the reader in Horace, Propertius, and Ovid. The pressure of patronage had its effect. “Write the *res invicti Caesaris*,” is the appeal of the patron, but the poet usually answers that he is not a writer of epic, but of satire, elegy—anything rather than epic. Hence the starting-point of many a program poem, for the poet defines his work in telling why he is especially adapted to it and in contrasting it with another genre. It is not necessary here to survey any considerable number of these poems. I select a few which support my general position.¹

Propertius ii. 34 (Rothstein) is in many ways a close parallel to the program satires of Horace.² The poet begins with the faithless act of his friend Lynceus as a concrete illustration of the power of love, not only over friends, but also poets. No type of poetry will aid Lynceus except that in which Propertius is king—erotic elegy. Then, dropping Lynceus and the episode with which the elegy opens, he passes to a general contrast between his own work and that of Vergil, which he eulogizes, and closes with an assertion that erotic elegy also has its proper sphere and the reward of fame. In the course of his pronouncements he mentions numerous genres—didactic poetry, Alexandrian elegy, epic, tragedy, and of course his own erotic elegy. His terminology is usually vague and never precisely technical. The *Aetia* of Callimachus are *non inflati somnia Callimachi* (32). Tragedy is *Aeschyleo verba coturno*—to take the clearest reference (41). The mere names of poets are used: Philetas, Antimachus, Homer, etc. But especially in the long passage on Vergil (61–80) and in the closing lines on his own work we find a very close parallel to the manner of Horace. Vergil's works are all designated by the usual vague terms—the famous announcement of the *Aeneid* (63–66), the *Bucolics* (67–76), the *Georgics* (77–78)—all periphrastically expressed; and when he arrives at his own work, a passage that seems “fairly to clamor” for at least a fairly precise term, what do we find?

¹ A convenient summary of many features of the program poem may be found in G. Riedner's *Typische Äußerungen der römischen Dichter über ihre Begabung, ihren Beruf, und ihre Werke*, Nürnberg, 1903, but he does not discuss terminology.

² It was the memory of this elegy that first raised strong doubts in my mind about the validity of Professor Hendrickson's argument.

non tamen *haec* ulli venient ingrata legenti,
sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit.

haec quoque perfecto *ludebat* Iasone Varro,
Varro Leucadiae maxima flamma sua;
haec quoque lascivi cantarunt scripta Catulli,
Lesbia quis ipsa notior est Helena
haec etiam docti confessa est pagina Calvi
cum caneret miserae funera Quintiliae.
et Gallus
Cynthia quin etiam versu laudata Properti,
hos inter si me ponere Fama volet.

The pronominal term, as vague in itself as possible, parallels exactly Horace's *haec ego ludo* (i. 10. 37), *hoc erat quod* (46)—indeed both poets close a program poem at the end of a book with similar broadsides of the same pronoun, cf. the end of Propertius' poem with the end of Horace i. 10, especially vss. 82, 83, 88, 92.¹ In both poems there is a contrast with epic and other genres—even with Vergil. Both poets appeal to restricted circles of readers. The pronouns and other vague terms which refer to the poet's own work are rendered clear in both by the development of the thought and by the contexts in which they stand, but neither poet has previously used any generic or very precise term for his own work. In fact Propertius, although in the first two books he often touches on his conception of elegy, has nowhere provided us with so thoroughgoing a discussion of elegy as we have in Horace i. 4 of satire. It is not until iv. 1. 135 that he uses the generic *elegi*, the only occurrence of the word—late in his work just as *satura* occurs relatively late in Horace's *Satires*.²

Now nobody will deny that the Roman elegists before Propertius knew a generic term for elegy, but it was not necessary to use such a term even in contexts that seem to us “fairly to clamor” for it. It

¹ There is good reason to believe that there were similar passages in Lucilius; cf. especially the opening of Book xxvi (Marx), where Lucilius speaks of the type of reader he desires, using *haec* (596) of his writings (repeated 610). The thought suggested by 1009, 1012, 1013 is similar.

² One has to gather the elements of Propertius' conception from many elegies and passages. Tibullus uses *elegi* once, and in Ovid it is not common in view of the bulk of his work. Barta cites four cases.

was not even necessary to make one of these terms part of the title of an elegiac *libellus*. There is evidence, indeed, that this was not usually done. In the same way Horace did not use the precise term *satura* even when discussing the nature of the *genre* nor did he use it in his title, although he knew and everybody knew that his *Sermones*¹ belonged to the genre, satire. Indeed, the satirists, even after the period when Professor Hendrickson thinks that *satura* was an accepted term, use the word just as rarely as Horace. The word does not occur in Persius at all and only four times in Juvenal, although the latter's work contains more than double the number of lines comprised in the *Satires* of Horace. Moreover nearly all the other precise and generic terms for poetry in Latin occur in the poets very infrequently. Barta classifies them all under “rarer terms.”

The first satire of Persius is a close parallel in many ways to Horace i. 4 and 10. Persius is writing a program satire in which, like Horace, he has occasion to mention many kinds of literature, including satire and his own work. There is the same combination of vague and precise terms: vs. 31, *dia poemata*; 43, *carmina*; 45–46, *si quid aptius hoc* (of satire); 67, *opus in mores* (satire); 76–78, *Brisaei venosus liber Atti Pacuvius Antiopa* (drama); 114 ff. (various allusions to satire), *secuit Lucilius urbem Flaccus libelle hoc ridere meum aspice et haec*, etc. Precise are the title *Ilias* (50) and *elegidia* (51).

But this paper is not primarily an investigation; it is rather the presentation of a point of view. I refrain, therefore, from amassing more evidence on this point. The inevitable conclusion is not that *satura* is missing from Horace *Satt.* i. 4 and 10 because it was not yet an accepted term, but that both its absence and Horace's vague and periphrastic terminology are merely part of the usual poetic manner of the Romans and that no inference can be drawn from this manner as to the date at which *satura* became an accepted term. In view of the treatment of technical and precise terms by other poets *satura* occurs quite as often and quite as early in Horace as we are entitled to expect. Indeed the occurrence in ii. 1. 1 is not due to any feeling on the part of Horace that he could then use it because

¹ The increasing influence on Roman literature of the diatribe probably influenced Horace in the choice of *sermo* as a title.

it was an accepted term, but is a part of the mock formality with which the poet consults old Trebatius. Lawyers are among those uncomfortable people who "call you down" for loose and inexact language. Horace knew this, as the whole satire proves. The legal term for satire was *satura* and had to be used in addressing a lawyer! The occurrence of the term in this passage, therefore, is due to artistic considerations.¹

Professor Hendrickson's second point may be briefly dismissed. There is no positive proof that Varro or Verrius Flaccus discussed the literary term *satura*, and the term does not occur in Varro's extant writings, although it is difficult to explain away the natural inferences based on the titles of the *Menippeae* and on Varro's lost work *De compositione saturarum*.² But like the absence of the term in Ennius and Lucilius the point is negative. Even if it could be proved that neither Ennius nor Lucilius employed the term *satura*, I would not grant that this term was not applied to their satires long before the time of Horace's literary activity. In fact, the entire argument based on what Ennius and Lucilius may, according to Marx and others, have called their satires excites my skepticism. Such argument casts on one side as mere inventions of the grammarians all citations of the fragments of Ennius and Lucilius as satires (*in saturam*, *saturis*, etc.), that is, we are asked to believe that the term *satura* was attached to the satires of these poets by grammarians who did not succeed in their fell purpose until after the time of Horace—and all this when there are only a score of fragments of Ennius that we are fairly certain belonged to his satires, when

¹ Cf. Kiessling-Heinze, *ad loc.* Leo (*Götting. gelehrt. Anz.* 1906, p. 859) remarks that the *lex operis*, in Horace's phrase, goes back to Lucilius.

² I need not dwell on these points because they have been urged by others; cf. especially Leo, *op. cit.* (preceding note); F. Lommatzsch, *Bu.* 139 (1908); E. Bickel, *ibid.* 140 (1908), p. 222; and most recently R. H. Webb in the last number of this journal, pp. 177-89. Leo's statement is brief and to the point: A comparison of Diomedes and Festus proves that Varro not only discussed but used *satura* as a generic term—if it is necessary to prove this of a man who wrote *saturae* and *De compositione saturarum*. The phrase *per saturam* implies a noun *satura*. Horace's references show that he was using a term long current. The grammarians, when they name Lucilius' works at all, call them *saturae*, and Horace's *sermones* and *epistulae*. *Poemata per saturam*, etc., do not occur applied to Lucilius. Diomedes (Varro) shows how Ennius arrived at the term *satura* and Kiessling has correctly stated the development after Ennius. (Leo evidently puts some trust in the bases of our knowledge.)

the once voluminous work of Lucilius is in veritable rags, and when at best the technical term could hardly have occurred often in their writings. Such argument neglects the inevitable tendency of all that grammatical activity which was well begun before Lucilius began to write and was in full blast during his lifetime as his own fragments prove. Back of this Roman activity and that of the Greeks who flocked to Rome lies that of the Alexandrian age, whose grammarians and critics named and docketed every sort of literature known to them and all the features of that literature. Their successors at Rome during the second and first centuries merely carried on the same methods—with which Professor Hendrickson himself has often dealt and to which he alludes in the article under discussion. It is inconceivable that these classifiers should not have settled on a generic term for the compositions of Lucilius until sixty or seventy years after his death even if we assume that neither he nor Ennius called their satires generically *satura*e. Our extant evidence points clearly to the views that this generic term was *satura*. This evidence begins, indeed, so far as the actual occurrence of the word is concerned, with Horace *Sat.* ii. 1. 1, but we must remember that the grammatical literature of the preceding seventy years and more—the very literature in which we might expect to find the technical term—is imperfectly known to us. Even the satires of Varro Atacinus and the *quidam alii* to whom Horace refers in that very concise history of the genre (i. 10, 46–47) are lost. We are restricted to references in more elevated kinds of prose such as the *Rerum rusticarum libri* of Varro, the *Auctor ad Herennium*, and Cicero's essays. It will be worth while to glance at these *testimonia*, since here again Professor Hendrickson's method is too narrow.

There are about forty references to Lucilius by name (noun or adjective) which antedate those of Horace—if we are very liberal, we may count nearly fifty. In these forty I include two or three passages which are themselves later than Horace, but contain allusions to Lucilius which are certainly earlier than Horace. The meager total is probably due to the fact that Lucilius was not used in the rhetorical schools as were Ennius, Plautus, etc., for example, in metaphrases. In the great majority of these references we could hardly look for a generic term, first, because the contexts are such that there is no

occasion for such a term; secondly, because nearly all the passages occur in *genera* in which according to Roman practice technical terms are rare. For the question here again is not how the work of Lucilius alone is alluded to by Roman writers, but how in general these writers allude to Roman poets of whom Lucilius is only one. I shall revert to this point. First let us examine the four passages in which we might with some reason look for an occurrence of the term *satura*. These are:

1. Varro *Rer. rust. liber* iii. 2. 17: L. Abuccius, homo, ut scitis, adprime doctus, cuius Luciliano charactere sunt libelli. This is the passage of which Marx and Hendrickson make so much.
2. Varro *De l. l.* v. 17 (Goetz-Schoell, 1910): A qua bipartita divisione Lucilius [Lucretius, MSS] suorum unius et viginti librorum initium fecit hoc “aetheris et terrae, etc.” Scaliger’s correction of Lucretius to Lucilius is certain.
3. Suetonius *De gramm.* 14: R. Curtius Nicias adhaesit Cn. Pompeio et C. Memmio . . . fuit et M. Ciceronis familiaris. . . . Huius de Lucilio libros etiam Santra [*satura* or *satyra*, MSS] comprobat. It is uncertain when Curtius Nicias wrote his work on Lucilius, but it may quite possibly have been before 40 B.C.¹
4. Suetonius *De gramm.* 2: After describing the activity of the early grammarians—ut carmina parum adhuc divulgata vel defunctorum amicorum vel si quorum aliorum probassent, diligentius retractarent ac legendο commentandoque et ceteris nota facerent—Suetonius gives some illustrations closing thus: ut Laelius Archelaus Vectiusque Philocomus Lucili saturas sc. pronuntiabant <familiaribus suis> [familiaris sui Marx with MSS], quas legisse se apud Archelaum Pompeius Lenaeus, apud Philocomum Valerius Cato praedicant. These two lecturers on Lucilius must have been at their work early in the first century B.C.

I exclude from these select passages Trebonius’ letter to Cicero (*Ad fam. xii. 16*) which both Marx and Hendrickson would include. The phraseology of the letter is obviously of the usual untechnical sort and there is an intentional contrast between the name *Lucilio* and the pronoun *nobis* which would have been spoiled, if Trebonius had said *Saturis Lucili* or the like.

Suetonius (*De gr. 2*) uses the term *Lucili saturas* which Marx and Hendrickson would of course not trace back to Varro or to his contemporaries of the Ciceronian age. If Varro himself in the first or

¹ Cf. Hillscher. *JJB*, Suppbd. XVIII (1892), p. 177.

second passage above cited had only used the same phrase, he would have spared our pains. As it is, instead of inferring too much from his silence, we must ask: What are the chances that *satura* would have been used in such passages as these, if it was then an accepted generic term? For the period involved this question resolves itself into two others: How are the poets referred to in the technical prose work (Varro, *De l. l.*)? and how are they referred to in more elevated prose (*Auctor. ad Herenn.*, Cicero, Varro's *Rer. rust.*)? Only by ascertaining the manner of citation as it concerns all the poets can we understand the manner of citation as it concerns one of the poets. I do not pretend to completeness on this point, for I am striving to make clear a tendency which would hardly be the clearer if based on exact statistics. This tendency will become evident to anybody who will devote a few hours to the study of the references contained in the indices of Marx's edition of the *Auctor ad Herennium*, 1894, Goetz and Schoell's edition of the *De lingua latina*, 1910, Keil's of the *Rer. rusticar.*, together with Merguet's *Lexicons* to Cicero's speeches and philosophical works, and Orelli's *Onomasticon*. The results are surprising. We expect a poet to use any term save a technical one in the majority of instances; we expect the same practice, though not to the same degree, in the more elevated kinds of prose; but we do not expect a grammarian to cheat us of his categories. He, at least, ought not to be afraid to call a spade a spade—and call it so often. But such a preconception based on the accurate habits of our modern tribe of grammarians and critics will prove a misconception if you try to apply it to Varro. In the *De lingua latina* the great Roman scholar refers hundreds of times to poets and poetical compositions of all sorts. Ennius, for example, is alluded to upward of seventy times. Often he does not even give the poet's name and we must identify the fragment or allusion as best we can. When he gives the name, we have all sorts of vague formulae: *apud Ennium* , *ut ait Ennius*, *significat Ennius quod ait* , *Ennius scribit* , *quo Ennius usus* , *Enni illud* , *eiusdem* (after having mentioned the name) , *quod Ennius cum ait* , *Ennius item*, etc. Not a single genre at which Ennius tried his hand—and he worked in nearly all the poetic genres—is mentioned in these references. Two fragments of the *Satires* (?) are given—eight, if we include the *Sota* and

Epicharmus, as I should not—but they are introduced by *apud Ennium, ut ait Ennius*, etc., in the usual fashion. The clearest references are those to the drama: *ut apud Ennium in Medea, in Andromacha* (no name), *dicit Andromeda . . . et Agammemno* (no name). Only one of Ennius' other works is cited in this way: *Epicharmus Enni Proserpinam appellat*. All told, there are only half a dozen citations as definite as this, and allusion by title, as workers in ancient literature know full well, does not fix the *genus*.

The references to Ennius are typical¹ of Varro's method (?) all through his work. Rarely, very rarely, we find a generic term (sometimes with the author's name omitted!). Here follow those I have noted: v. 25, *Afranius in Togata*; vi. 19, *Togata praetexta* (sic G-S)—no name of a poet; vii. 95 *apud Matium in Atellanis*²; cf. vii. 29 and 84; vi. 55, ab eodem verbo *fari fabulae, ut tragoediae et comoediae, dictae*; vi. 58, *actores novam fabulam cum agunt*; cf. 77 (*bis*); vi. 89, *Boeotia ostendit quam co[m]m<o>ediam A<qui>lii esse dicunt*; vi. 76, *scenici plerique*; vii. 10, *Papinii epigrammation*; v. 69, *ut physici dicunt*.

This is a meager showing of generic terms for a work that is fairly stuffed with references to the poets—a veritable *genus farcimini poetici!* The numerous precise terms for various types of the drama are alone fairly well represented. *Epos, elegi, epigramma* (cf. *epigrammation*), *lyricus, melos* or *melicus*, etc., do not occur at all, though Varro knew all these terms. Is it surprising that in less than a score³ of certain references to the satires of Ennius and Lucilius the term *satura* does not occur?

If Varro's references in this technical grammatical work are thus lacking in precision we can hardly hope for better things in more elevated kinds of prose. The *Rerum rusticarum libri* represent Varro's most artistic prose. The difference in style and tone as

¹ Vahlen, *Ennius*, p. xxxii, makes some sensible remarks about Varro's manner of citation in the *De l. l.* He cites *non ut alii grammatici . . . sed ut homo doctus, qui doctis hominibus scribit*. He never mentions the *Annales* and names very few of the tragedies of Ennius although citing these works very often. Vahlen attributes the absence of *saturae* or *saturarum libri* in the case of Lucilius to the same habit.

² If these are not titles?

³ Two references to possible satires of Ennius, fourteen to Lucilius by name. Six other references, where the name does not occur, are assigned to Lucilius.

compared with the *De lingua latina* is very great. The aged scholar here makes a mighty effort to cast aside the apparatus of his philological manner and treat his subject with the skill of a *littérateur*. If he has not succeeded, he has at least produced a very readable essay—far removed from the formless statement of facts which characterizes the *De lingua latina*. It is a wider difference than we should find between an article by one of us on "The Dative in Plautus" for the *Philologus* and another on "Trouting in the Canadian Rockies" for the *Century*. This effort to conform in the *Rerum rusticarum libri* to the stylistic requirements of the genre explains sufficiently to my mind the much-exploited phrase *Luciliano charactere libelli*: the phrase represents what the old scholar regarded as "the lighter touch"! And it is in character from a man who wrote a work Περὶ χαρακτήρων.

But how does Varro refer in his agricultural dialogue to other poets? In Keil's *Index* about a dozen poets are named and there are altogether fourteen or fifteen references to poetic compositions of various sorts. Only once in the entire essay does Varro use the name of a poetic genre (iii. 16. 4, Archelaus in epigrammate), and only two other certain references to poetry are at all precise (ii. 11. 11, ut apud Caecilium in Hypobolimaeo . . . apud Terentium in Heautontimorumeno). Thus the phrase *Luciliano charactere libelli* is not at all abnormal, so far as the failure to include a generic term is concerned.

The manner of the *Auctor ad Herennium* is much less exact in this particular than that of Varro or Cicero. With the spirit of a braggadocio and a robber who purloins the goods of others and displays them as his own he carries the intentional suppression of names, a trait familiar enough in Varro and Cicero, to an extreme. Not a single Greek writer of prose or poetry is mentioned by name although the *Auctor* is indebted to many Greeks for the material and illustrations in his own work.¹ With the Roman writers he is somewhat more generous as behooves one who vaunts his Romanism so insistently, but he is far from liberal. Marx's *Index auctorum latinorum* shows that only seven Roman writers are mentioned by

¹ Cf. Marx's *Prolegomena* (1894), pp. 112 ff., especially p. 115. Time has wreaked a curiously just vengeance in suppressing the *Auctor's* own name.

name—not all poets. There are, as in Varro and Cicero, a good many nameless citations—I count about a dozen—and even where names are given, the allusions are sometimes to facts in the lives of the poets, not to their works. Thus our material here is meager, but the tendency is the same that we have traced in Varro: the *Auctor* uses a generic term in only one of his references to poets (iv. 4. 7 <Enni> de *tragoediis* aut de *Pacuvianis*)¹ and his terminology in all save two or three references is far from precise.²

A very brief discussion of the manner of Cicero's references to the poets will suffice for my present purpose, since the presentation of all the facts from Orelli's *Onomasticon* and Merguet's *Lexicons* bearing on our point could hardly alter the general results. Cicero is like his friend Varro in this matter. The general truth is well stated by Vahlen (*Opusc.* I, 88 ff., originally published 1879–80): *Etenim Cicero magnus amator antiquae poesis Latinae sed versus citat non ut grammaticus verborum curiosus sed ut qui scientibus scribit quos verbo admonuisse satis sit, alienaque cum suis saepe ita committit vix ut saturam agnoscas.*³ Vahlen is interested in the question because of its bearing on textual problems, but his statement might have been made on purpose for my argument. If we bear in mind the great variety and the great extent of Cicero's writings together with the very numerous references to the poets, we shall find generic terms surprisingly infrequent. The only one that can be called common is *fabula*. *Comoedia (comicus)* and *tragoedia (tragicus)* are represented fairly well. There are a few cases of *epigramma* and of *elogium* (=epitaph). And here we step off into the vague. Of *epos (epicus)*, *elegi*, *lyricus*, *melos*, *Atellana*, *praetexta*, *palliata*, *togata*, I have found no cases. There is one

¹ *Enni* is restored in this passage with probability. Marx, as usual, is not content with the solid and reasonable interpretation of the *Auctor's* manner of citation which he himself points out, but must skate on the thin ice of theory whither I cannot follow him.

² Allusions to poetic *genera*, whether connected or not with a poet's name, are very rare. I count five or six only.

³ The paper by M. Radin on "Literary References in Cicero's Orations" (*Class. Jour.* VI, 209–17) reiterates some of the main peculiarities of Cicero's citations—especially the tendency (purposed in the speeches) to deprecate special knowledge. I have not seen E. Schollmeyer's dissertation, *Quid Cicero de poetis Romanorum iudicaverit* (1884), or W. Zillinger *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter* (1911), Würzburg.

case of *neniae*, one of *melici poetae*, one or two of *mimus* (=a play). But these exceptions prove the rule.¹ Writers of elevated prose then as now thought it sufficient to allude to a poet without classifying him.² Significant in this connection and in connection with Vahlen's remark is the common type of citation *illud Enni (Plauti, Pacuvi, etc.)*—an admission that the words quoted are familiar. Hardly less significant is the commonest type of all—the identification of a poet with his work: *Plautus, apud Plautum, ut Plautus ait*, etc. This is still the prevalent manner of allusion to the great poets, but the educated Roman knew his “great ones” far better than we know ours. It is easy, therefore, to explain why Varro even in his *De lingua latina* uses nothing more distinctive than the name *Ennius* in fifty out of seventy or more references to that great pioneer of Roman literature. In fact to Varro, to Cicero, to Horace, and the rest Homer was Homer, Plautus was Plautus, and—Lucilius was Lucilius. This naturally suggests Professor Hendrickson's last point: that for Varro, Cicero, Velleius, etc., the work of Lucilius is “as individual as the man himself.”

The refutation of this apparent argument has already been partly given: the citation of Lucilius as *Lucilius*, the identification of the man with his work, does not show that Lucilius was treated as especially “individual,” for all the other poets are cited in the same way. We know that the work of Lucilius bore the mark of a strong individuality—this must be true of an *inventor* such as Lucilius was—but there are no unusual *testimonia* to this fact before the time of

¹ Professor Hendrickson infers from the vagueness with which the name of Lucilius figures in comparison with other prominent names in the works of Cicero that Cicero knew no generic term for the poet's work. This inference becomes very improbable when we remember that no other early poet of equal prominence confined himself to a single genre like that of Lucilius which was practiced by very few and was not likely to be confused with anything else. If in the citations of other poets vagueness is the rule and is no indication, as we have seen, of the non-existence of a generic term, Lucilius cannot be viewed as an exception since vagueness in a reference to Lucilius could have caused no misunderstanding as to his genre.

² Professor Hendrickson (note, p. 135) considers it a “curious and noteworthy circumstance” that Cicero cites a fragment of Naevius as *in Naevi ludo*, whereas Verrius alludes to the same as *in satyra*. This is, of course, no indication that *satyra* was not applied to this work of Naevius until the time of Verrius, for aside from the uncertainty whether the two passages refer to the same work of Naevius, the practice of Roman writers makes it perfectly natural that Cicero in an *essay* should use a descriptive term, *ludus*, and Verrius, a grammarian, the precise term, *satura*.

Horace—nothing so abnormal in the references to his work that we are at all justified in fancying Lucilius as a sort of generic individuality from which little by little the *genus* became separated. Such a theory might find a place somewhere in the literary infancy of Greece, for example, but not in the age of Cicero or of Horace when grammatical and critical methods were already old and well established. In order to prove that the individuality of Lucilius' work was so powerful that it served for two generations to hold in solution, so to speak, a generic term, it is necessary to show that there is something very peculiar and impressive in the *testimonia* before the time of Horace. This is hardly possible; but even if it were, the fact could be used on either side of the present question. The marked individuality and the many unique features of Lucilius' work are facts which to my mind, for example, render it not less likely, but more likely that a generic term for that work was established long before the time of Horace. Other early Roman poets had been *inventores* albeit not in the same fashion and degree as Lucilius and some of their "inventions" enjoyed considerable vogue for a long period, but the Romans had no difficulty in naming them at once and that too with names which were often Roman; cf. *togata*, *praetexta*, etc. None of these genres was so permeated with Italian traits, so instinct with the Italian spirit, as that of Lucilius—none had the vitality of that *genus* whose form and dominant characteristics he established for later ages; but there is no evidence, aside from the late appearance of the term *satura*, that the Romans stood in amaze at this creation and for seventy or a hundred years failed to recognize its generic character by a distinctive name. On the contrary there is good evidence that the *genus* was not only practiced in the interval between Lucilius and Horace, but that the grammarians, the *nomenclatores*, were at work upon it. If the early Romans could invent a minute Roman terminology for new forms of the drama, it is not pressing analogy too much to argue that they and their descendants agreed upon a generic term for satire.

I have tried to show that the facts on which Professor Hendrickson bases his views concerning *satura* are merely part of a large number of similar facts concerning Roman literature in general. Viewed in this broader way they are perfectly normal and are there-

fore devoid of the special significance which has been attached to them. If then they do not serve to establish the theory of a very late development of *satura* as a literary term, we may return with greater confidence to the old view which attributes the use of the term to Ennius and Lucilius. This view, in spite of the brilliant heresy of Marx and Hendrickson, still holds its ground with the majority of those who have worked in the field of satire, and new champions, not always with new arguments, are constantly arising to defend it.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE